DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 862 CS 504 736

AUTHOR Neal, Kay
TITLE The Relationship between Human Communication Functional Dominance and the Dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structures on Leadership Styles.
PUB DATE Nov 82
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (68th, Louisville, KY, November 4-7, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Freshmen; *Communication Research; Comparative Analysis; Higher Education; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; *Research Methodology; Speech Communication; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Dominance

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine whether there is a significant correlation between the scores obtained on a communication functional dominance instrument and those obtained from an instrument of the Ohio State Leadership Scales. Subjects, 102 freshman speech students, completed the Human Communication Functional Dominance instrument, which measures linking (social) and regulation (verbal control of others) functions of leadership behavior. They also completed the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (from the Ohio State Leadership Scales), which measures the consideration (mutual trust) and initiating structure (directing subordinates) dimensions of leadership. It was hypothesized that subjects scoring high in one or the other of the functional dominance characteristics would also score high on the parallel function of the leadership behavior questionnaire. The total number of linking and regulation responses was recorded from the functional dominance instrument and the number of initiating and consideration responses was recorded from the leadership behavior questionnaire. The subjects were then rank ordered on the four characteristics. The correlation coefficients found between the variables were extremely low and did not support the hypothesis. (Copies of the instruments used in the study are appended.) (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED251862

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN COMMUNICATION FUNCTIONAL DOMINANCE AND THE DIMENSIONS OF CONSIDERATION AND INITIATING STRUCTURES ON LEADERSHIP STYLES

By

Kay Neal

University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

A Paper Presented to

The Speech Communication Association

Louisville, Kentucky

November, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kay E. Neal

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504 736

Section I

Problem and Definition of Terms

Dance and Larson (1976) postulated that human communication (spoken symbolic language) has three functions: (a) linking an individual to his environment, (b) developing higher mental processes, and (c) regulating human behavior. It has been theorized that these functions are exemplified in the concept human communication functional dominance (Dance, 1976). Defined generally, human communication functional dominance is the extent to which an individual manifests behaviors characteristic of one of the functions over the others in specific speech communication situations (Dance, 1976). Although Dance suggests that the "well balanced" individual will demonstrate behaviorisms equally distributed among the three functions during most communicative situations, this could be a difficult task for some. As Dance notes:

> In a family we will see one member taking primary responsibility for establishing the emotional climate (although not totally neglecting the other functions); another member concerned with planning (Function Two); yet another with getting things organized and accomplished (Functions Two and Three). So too in a school; or in a team; or in a government agency; or in a small business or in a large multi-national corporate enterprise.(Dance, 1976, 9-10)

A similar phenomenon has been observed in the styles of leadership utilized by various individuals in a variety of small group settings.

Applebaum (1974) explained, "Some leaders have a knack for controlling and dispelling interpersonal squabbles in small groups; others have a knack for forcing the group to accomplish its task" (p. 376). This difference in leadership has generated much research which led Robert Bales to conclude:

> There may be two separate "specialists" among leaders of small groups--one, a task-environmental leader; the other, an interpersonal leader. Stated another way, one could say that one type of leader performs task-related functions and another type performs group-maintenance functions. The interpersonal leader, or group-maintenance specialist occupies a role that enables him to perform activities that contribute to the organization and harmony of the group. The task-environmental leader or task-specialist, performs activities that contribute more directly to the group's successful attainment of its collective aims and objectives. (Bales, 1953)

The similarities between Dance's description of the roles family members may hold and the statements by Applebaum and Bales pertaining to leadership styles are quite apparent. The hypothesis for the similarities is three-fold: (a) the theory of projection, (b) the domination of the functions in human communication interactions, and (c) the definitions of the constructs.

Dance's theory of projection provides one rationale for the perceived relationship between leadership styles and human communication

functional dominance. He explicates this theory in the following passage.

> . . . human beings project their internalized speech communication functions onto their externalized interpersonal social structures and organizations. These functional projections begin with the family group and the family, . . . in turn, is the prototype which prepares . . . the individual for organizational roles in the larger society, so that eventually we see reflected in society as a whole the functions . . . of speech communication in the individual. (Dance & Larson, 1972, p. 91)

Johnson (1979) establishes further support for this theory in her dissertation. "As the functions develop in an individual they become an essential ingredient in his/her interactions with others in the environment" (Johnson, 1979, p. 2). If the human communication functions do become an integral component in one's relationships, it would not be surprising to see one of them influencing behavior in all communication situations including how one behaves within small groups of people. Thus, because of projection, an individual who is dominated by the regulatory function may well be high task-orientated in his leadership style.

Domination of the human communication function in the behavioral process comprises the second reason for the relationship between human communication functional dominance and leadership styles.

The functions of communication operate as a constant, inevitable, and unconscious part of one's life (Dance & Larson, 1976). Assuming this to be true, it would be difficult for an individual to manipulate the functions in such a manner as to intentionally control or determine his behavior patterns. For example, a person deemed to be dominated by the linking function, could not consistently and continuously ignore this domination by behaving as a "task-specialist" in a group. Eventually, the linking behaviorisms would surface and the individual would slip into a "group-maintenance" role without ever being conscious of it. Therefore, the human communication functions would be impossible for one to control in the long term and should be apparent during the majority of one's communicative interactions.

Finally, the operational definitions of the constructs aid in explaining the similarity. The definitions of "task-specialist" (initiating structure defined on page 8) and "interpersonal-specialist" (consideration defined on page 7) are definitions of similar constructs that attempt to isolate the same behavior patterns. For example, linking behavior includes "attempts to understand and take into consideration the perspective of others" (Dance & Larson, 1976) while the consideration structure for leadership dimensions focuses on behavior that is "characterized by mutual trust and consideration of others' feelings" (Fleishman & Peters, 1962). The behaviors isolated by the variables appear to be quite similar.

A method for testing such an assumption is the major focus of this study. Johnson (1979) has developed an instrument to measure human communication functional dominance and has run a few pilot studies to assess the instrument's reliability and validity. In addition, The Ohio State University conducted a series of research programs designed to create and validate an instrument to measure leadership behavior. Two leader behavior dimensions entitled Consideration and Initiating Structure were isolated through these studies. The measuring tools developed to enable one to isolate these two dimensions were the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Collectively, they comprise what have come to be known as the Ohio State Leadership Scales.

If the theoretical analysis above is correct, the instruments may well be measuring similar constructs which are part of the same domain (linking - consideration structure, regulation = initiation structure). Additionally, if the assumption is valid, the results of this study should contribute to the concurrent validity of both measuring tools.

The primary purpose of this study is to discover if there is a significant correlation between the scores obtained on the human communication functional dominance instrument with those scores obtained on the Ohio State Leadership Scales. Specifically, the study attempts to discover if those individuals deemed high on the

linking function will also score high on the consideration structure dimension of the Ohio State Leadership Scales. Secondly, the study hopes to discover if those subjects scoring high on the regulatory function will also score high on the initiation structure of the Ohio State Leadership Scales.

Significance of the Study

This study appears to offer three significant contributions to the domain of human communication. One of the basic achievements of this study would be its contributions toward further developments of Dance's theory of functional dominance. As stated previously, the results of this investigation could help provide empirical, evidential support for the concept of projection and its relationship to functional dominance in interpersonal communication situations.

Secondly, the results will provide greater insight into the qualities and styles of leadership that emerge during interactions in small groups. This research could be additional support for the "trait approach" to leadership investigations. It is possible that communication dominance is a far more critical trait necessary for leadership emergence than such traits as intelligence, personality, or education. Given the millions of dollars spent annually on leadership training programs in business and industry, such knowledge could be imperative.

Thirdly, and possibly most important, this investigation could aid in yielding concurrent validity to both measuring instruments.

Johnson (1979) identifies the need for this. ". . . in addition to testing the instrument (human communication functional dominance) for reliability using a larger more diversified sample, various tests of the instrument's validity should be conducted in some fashion . . . For example, concurrent validity should be assessed using criteria other than the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation instrument" (Johnson, 1979, p. 96). Although the Ohio State Leadership Scales have high reliability in terms of internal consistency, the concurrent validity of the instrument is questionable. It is the concensus of authors in the leadership area that the instrument does not "tie into a network of related concepts"(Runkel & McCrath, 1972, p. 162). Schriescheim and Kerr (1974) concluded that "an examination of studies using the Ohio State scales failed to uncover any program related to similar concepts" (p. 758). Therefore, this particular investigation would be beneficial to enhancing the validity of both instruments.

With this in mind, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Will there be a significant relationship between the linking scores obtained on the instrument to measure human communication functional dominance and the consideration scores obtained on the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

   a. Will individuals determined to be dominant in the linking function also be dominant in the consideration

dimension of the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

b. Will individuals determined to be dominant in the linking function also be low in the consideration dimension of the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

2. Will there be a significant relationship between the regulation scores obtained on the instrument to measure human communication functional dominance and the initiating scores obtained on the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

a. Will individuals determined to be dominant in the regulation function also be dominant in the initiating scores obtained on the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

b. Will individuals determined to be dominant in the regulation function be low in the initiating dimension on the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

Before proceeding any further, there are a number of terms crucial to the study that need to be defined.

Human communication functional dominance--Operationalized in this study by the measuring instrument contained in Appendix A.

Linking function--pertains to an individual's ability to socialize, adapt, and integrate with the environment in an effort to reduce entrophy vis a vis spoken symbolic langauge (Dance & Larson, 1976, p. 55). This is operationalized through behaviors that include the establishment and/or maintenance of interpersonal relationships and attempts to understand and take into consideration the perspectives

of others--relying heavily on these behaviors is dominant in the linking function.

Regulation function--concern with verbal or symbolic regulation of human behavior (Dance & Larson, 1976, p. 29). Examples of this behavior are verbal attempts to control behavior of others.

Consideration--This dimension reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas, and consideration of their feelings (Fleishman & Peters, 1962).

Initiating Structure--This dimension reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension describes individuals who play a more active role in directing group activities through planning, scheduling, etc. (Fleishman & Peters, 1962).

Leadership Opinion Questionnaire--It is a Likert-type attitude scale which attempts to measure how the supervisor thinks he should behave in his leadership role (Korman, 1966).

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--It typically measures subordinate perceptions of supervisory behavior (Korman, 1966).

In the next section, a review of the pertinent literature necessary for understanding the concepts and measuring instruments utilized in this investigation will be presented.

Section II

A Review of the Pertinent Literature

Two kinds of literature seem most relevant to the purpose of this study: (a) experimental studies concerning the development of the Ohio State Leadership Scales, (b) experimental studies concerning the development of the measuring instrument for human communication functional dominance. For the sake of clarity, this chapter will be divided into four sections: (a) the historical development of the Ohio State Leadership Scales, (b) a critical assessment of the reliability and validity of the instrument as a measurement tool, (c) the development of the human communication functional dominance instrument, (d) a critical assessment of the reliability and validity of the instrument as a measurement tool.

Historical Development of the Ohio State Leadership Scales

This section reviews the individual monographs that compose Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement--the publication which explicates the procedures involved in the creation of these questionnaires as research tools.

Hemphill and Coons (1957) designed the original Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as a method of describing how a leader carries out his activities (i.e. whether or not the leader displays dominating behaviorisms). In creating the questionnaire, nine dimensions of leader behavior were established such as communication, integration, production emphasis, fraternization, initiation, to name

a few. Items of behavior were then constructed to represent the above dimensions. One hundred and fifty items were then selected from the pool and arranged in a preliminary questionnaire. The preliminary questionnaire was administered to 357 individuals.

Three kinds of information were sought concerning the performance of each of the 150 items in the leader behavior description questionnaire.

1. How are respondents' descriptions of their leader distributed among the 5 choices of adverbs presented to them?

2. Are the items which make up a dimension internally consistent?

3. Does the instrument perform differently when used for self-description than when used to describe someone else? The results indicated that no one response was selected more frequently than the others and that leaders, in describing their own behavior, tended to pick items of a more favorable tone.

In order to explore the structure of the relationships among the dimensions, a factor analysis was performed: One for the subordinates' descriptions of their leaders and the other for the leaders' descriptions of their own behaviors. The analysis identified three general factors among the nine dimensions: social agreeableness, drive for goal attainment, and emphasis on group interaction.

It was necessary at this point to cross validate the results of the factor analysis. Therefore, Halpin and Winer (1957) conducted a factorial study of the LBQD on air force personnel. A Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire consisting of 130 items was administered to crew members who described air crew commanders. A factor analysis of the intercorrelations among nine dimensions resulted in the

emergence of four factors. These factors were identified by the researchers as Consideration, Initiating Structure, Production Emphasis and Social Awareness. However, Consideration and Initiating Structure accounted for 83% of the total variance. Thus, the next step involved creating short scales for measuring these two factors. This was done by only scoring the 15 items on the questionnaire that measured Consideration and the 15 items that measured Initiating Structure. The odd-even estimates of reliability yielded .87 for Consideration and .75 for Initiating Structure. When the Spearman-Brown formula was applied the reliabilities for these items became .93 and .86 respectively.

Halpin (1957, p. 52) administered the LBQD to aircraft commanders to further study the dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure as they affect the evaluation of a leader. The results revealed that the correlation between the two dimensions was .51. The ratings of the commander by his supporters were correlated significantly with the Initiating Structure scores (.47). The ratings of the commander by his crew members were correlated to the greatest degree with Consideration (.71).

To determine the relation between a leader's ideal and his actual leadership behavior as observed by his subordinates, Halpin (1975, p. 65) performed another study on both the educational administrators and aircraft commanders. The LBDQ was given to each of these groups and the subjects were asked to describe their own ideal behavior as

leaders. Simultaneously, the "real" behavior of each subject was described by several subordinates on separate forms of the questionnaire. Two sets of scores were obtained for the Consideration behavior and the Initiating Structure (real and ideal). It was found that there was a low relationship between real scores and ideal scores on both dimensions. Halpin suggests "that a leader's beliefs about how he should behave as a leader are not highly associated with his behavior as described by his followers" (1975, p. 65).

It had become apparent that Air Force crews and commanders had composed a disportionate amount of the samples tested, and that other populations were needed if the leadership scales were to be useful for measurement. Therefore, Hemphill (1957, p. 74) decided to test the LBDQ at a liberal arts college. The research project was designed to explore the relationship between leader behavior of a department chairman and the reputation of the department. The results from the questionnaires revealed that the "reputation" for being well administered is correlated to the department chairman who is described by his subordinates to be average on both the dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure. This indicated once again, that the most effective leaders possessed both characteristics.

In 1973, Badin (p. 380) felt it was necessary to test the two dimensions across various situations to see if the measuring instruments would yield the same results. The aim of the study was to examine the extent to which the relationships between Consideration

and Initiating Structure were affected by certain situational variables. Group size, tenure, position power, and task structure were studied to see if they affected the relationships between C. and I.S. The subjects were 489 males of a large manufacturing company. The results indicated that C. was positively related to satisfaction across all conditions. I.S. was negatively correlated to group effectiveness for small groups, seasoned employees, high-position power, and high-task structure. The rest of the variables did not yield any significant relationships with the two dimensions.

To shed some light as to the degree of predictive validity the instruments may possess, Petty and Pryor (1973, p. 383) designed a study to examine the predictive validity of I.S. and C. as measured by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) and LBDQ, for a sample of ROTC students. The subjects were 68 ROTC students who filled out the LOQ and the LBDQ after participating in a leaderless group. Four to five months later their performances at a summer field training was measured and correlated with their scores on the C. and I.S. dimensions of the questionnaires. The only significant correlation that appeared was between LBDQ-C and the individual's performances on field test.

The Ohio State Leadership research has often sustained the criticism that the studies fail to take situational variables into account (Korman, 1966). In an effort to respond to such criticism, Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy, and Stogdill (1974) attempted to identify

those situational elements which were operationalizable, and which had been found in past research to yield significant influence upon relationships between the variables C. and I.S. Such variables included: subordinate considerations (expertise, experience, competence, knowledge of job), supervisor considerations (similarity of attitudes and behavior to those of higher management, and task considerations (degree of time urgency, amount of physical danger, presence of external stress, degree of autonomy). From these variables, the authors advanced two general postulates of leadership affectiveness. Postulate 1--The more that subordinates are dependent upon the leader for provision of valued or needed services, the higher the positive relationships will be between leader behavior measures and subordinate satisfaction and performance. Postulate 2--The more the leader is able to provide subordinates with valued, needed, or expected services, the higher the positive relationships will be between leader behavior measures and subordinate satisfaction and performance.

Schriesheim, House, and Kerr (1976) attempted to show that important definitional differences of I.S. existed between various versons of the leadership scale. In addition, they conducted an empirical examination of items of the different I.S. instruments to reveal even greater differences than the definitions would indicate. A sampling procedure similar to that used by Hemphill in the first Ohio State study was employed. Questionnaires were administered to 242 hourly employees at The Ohio State University. The questionnaire

consisted of 94 items, 76 of which were drawn from the Ohio State behavior questionnaires (early and revised LBDQ and SBDQ). The three versions of the scales were factor analyzed. The results indicated that the SBDQ had two factors--Flexibility and Autocratic-Punitive Behavior, the early LBDQ had two factors--Communication, and Autocratic-Punitive Behavior, and the revised LBDQ also had two factors--Communication, and Restriction of Freedom of Action. The authors concluded that such differences in emerging factors contributed significantly in all probability to the confusion and inconsistency of findings in past research. They suggested that if similar confusion is to be prevented in the future, it is imperative that researchers clearly and correctly label the form of the leadership scale they use. The fact that this is a problem was revealed by one-sixth of the recent leadership literature either fails to specify the version used or incorrectly cites one version when another has actually been used.

The studies reported in this section are certainly not an exhaustive list of the numbers of experiments that have been conducted utilizing one or more forms of the questionnaires. Schriesheim and Kerr (1974, p. 756) report that hundreds of studies have examined Consideration and Initiating Structure and their effects upon subordinate satisfaction, performance and other criteria. However, due to space and time considerations, it would be impossible to review all of them in detail. Therefore, the studies reviewed in

in this paper provide a representative list of the type of work being completed in this area.

Critical Assessment of the LOQ and LBDQ as a Measuring Tool

A number of criticisms have been advanced concerning the usefulness of the questionnaires as measuring instruments by a variety of authors. In this section, these criticisms will be examined in an attempt to evaluate the instrument. The questionnaires will be analyzed in terms of content validity, predictive validity, and reliability.

Content Validity

It is apparent in the historical development of the tool, that several versions of the Ohio State Leadership Scales exist, all of which purport to measure the dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure. However, the different forms contain different items and may not measure the same behaviors presented in the definition of each dimension. Schriescheim and Kerr (1974) note "Clinical analysis indicates that all but the revised LBDQ (Form XII) include items which clearly measure extraneous leader behavioral dimensions" (p. 756). When one reviews the items included in the questionnaire, this is quite apparent. (The questionnaire is contained in Appendix B). For example, item 6 for Initiating Structure (I rule with an iron hand) measures not only the supervisor's concern for goal attainment, but also his ability to give his subordinates freedom of action and choice and implies punitive characteristics. The item

has a very negative connotation which clearly was not the intent of the original definition of Initiating Structure. Item 22 (I "needle" foremen for greater work effort) also implies the same negative value to Initiating Structure. Item 13 (I criticize the foremen in front of others) is NOT Consideration Structure according to the theoretical definition, but is listed under the category.

Development of the Human Communication Functional Dominance Scale

This section will review the procedures which led to the creation and validation of the "functional dominance" scale as developed by Johnson (1979) in her dissertation. Although this will not be an exhaustive review of all the procedures and chronological steps incorporated for the development of the final instrument, it should provide the reader with a sufficient background for understanding the history behind the instrument.

In creating an item pool for the instrument, three criteria were utilized: (a) Are the items situationally appropriate for the population taking the test, (b) Are the items easily scoreable, (c) Are the items representative of the construct (Johnson, 1979, p. 48-49). It was determined that the situations encompassed in the instrument were representative of everyday situations that college students (who composed the sample tested) often came into contact or that the college students could appreciate even though they had not directly experienced a similar situation.

There were two options available for meeting criteria two,

easily scoreable. The subjects could either write in a short sentence or two explaining their responses to the situation or select out of previously conceived answers, the response which best fit what they would do in the situation. Since writing in sentences was time consuming for the subject and made the administration of the test more difficult and such responses would have to be categorized in a subjective manner, the latter method was selected.

A panel of experts were utilized to meet the third criteria, representation of the construct. Each member of the panel evaluated the original item pool (40 items) and was asked to define each of the three responses to a situation in terms of the function it represented. Thirty-eight items were defined unanimously by the panel to be representative of the construct they were measuring.

The panel next expressed concern about the items in four areas: (a) social desirability of linking responses as compared to regulatory responses, (b) repetitive length of responses, (c) inconsistent length of items/responses, i.e. regulatory responses appeared to be much shorter than either mentation or linking responses, and (d) the overall length of the test. The instrument was further revised to satisfy the concerns of the panel.

The next step was the refinement of the instrument which involved four procedures: (a) pre-testing the items, (b) first item analysis, (c) constructivism, and (d) second item analysis.

The pre-testing involved 15 undergraduate college students from

the University of Denver who were randomly selected as subjects. These individuals responded to the 38 items initially, and then were questioned about the test in regard to the understandability of the test, items which were more socially desirable, apparent patterns in the responses and the purpose of the instrument. None of the answers given by the students suggested that there was any grave concern in those areas about the instrument.

The instrument was once again refined and then administered to 33 subjects randomly selected from undergraduate level speech communication courses at the University of Denver. The data resulting from this testing was then submitted to item analysis to determine if the items each contributed equally to the total score. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation was computed between each item's sub-score and the corresponding total sub-score. Items considered to be the weakest as a result of this correlation were reworded again before the constructivism check took place.

Constructivism emphasizes ". . . the central role of interpretive processes in human interaction" (Delia, 1977, p. 66). ". . . it is always the subject's constructions and not the experimenter's that are of interest" (Delia, 1977, p. 77). Therefore, Johnson submitted the instruments to 10 subjects from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for further testing. After the students had completed the test, the researcher went over the instrument, item by item, to check the subjects' interpretation of the questions. This resulted

in only a few word changes.

The instrument was then submitted for the second testing and item analysis. The instrument was administered to 40 subjects randomly selected from the basic undergraduate communication course at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. As a result of the Point Biserial Correlations between scores, 14 items were eliminated making the final instrument 24 items in total.

Test-retest reliability was utilized by Johnson for determining the reliability of the instrument. The instrument was administered to 96 college students from Milwaukee and after three weeks, the instrument was re-administered to 30 of the original 96 students. The results indicated correlations of .73 for linking responses, .68 for mentation, and .46 for regulation responses.

Concurrent validity of the instrument was determined by correlating the results of this measurement with the instrument entitled Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation (Schutz, 1963, 1966). The three variables Johnson selected on the FIRO to correlate the results were "Expressed Inclusion" and "Expressed Affection: for the linking function" and "Expressed Control" for the regulation function. Results of the correlation indicated a .43 for linking/ Exhibited Inclusion, .39 for linking/Exhibited Affection, and .24 for regulation/Exhibited Control.

Critical Assessment of Johnson's Instrument as a Measuring Tool

Due to the recency of the development of this instrument, it has

yet to be published or critically evaluated by numerous researchers. Therefore, the critical comments presented in this paper are based only on the personal interpretations of this author. In this section, the instrument will be analyzed in terms of reliability, content validity, and concurrent validity.

Reliability

The test-retest reliability yielded a strong correlation for the linking responses and a much smaller correlation for the regulation responses. This could be due to the social desirability of the linking responses. Further research would need to be done in this area to more accurately check the reliability especially considering a sample size of only 30 subjects. Johnson makes note of this as a limitation to the measuring tool. "The number of subjects used for various stages of data collection was relatively small. This factor should be kept in mind especially when reviewing the results of the validity and reliability checks" (Johnson, 1979, p. 94).

Content Validity

The content validity (does the instrument tap the domain it wishes to measure) is extremely high. Since a panel of five experts were unanimously agreed that each of the responses for the 24 items on the instrument described the appropriate behavior for the specific communication function, it is difficult for one to find fault with the content validity. Again, the small number of subjects tested for determination of the validity may be a qu[illegible]nable factor.

Concurrent Validity

The instrument is extremely weak in the area of concurrent validity. It was only correlated with one instrument and the results of the correlation could not verify the validity since they were extremely small (.43, .39, .24). Again, Johnson makes reference to this:

> The instrument is limited by the fact that only two procedures were followed to investigate the validity of the instrument. Although the content validity tended to support the instrument, it is vital that the instrument be subjected to validation utilizing criteria other than another instrument. In addition, the instrument is limited by the fact that only the linking and regulatory aspects were subject to the concurrent portion of the validity check. (1979, p. 95)

It is also very possible that the instrument utilized for the concurrent validity check does not measure the same constructs as the functional dominance instrument and therefore, would be an inappropriate measurement for comparison.

In the next section, the methods and procedures utilized in this investigation will be outlined.

Section III

Methods and Procedures

The procedures used in the study are described below. The

The procedural steps are not presented in chronological sequence, but are organized by subjects, materials, administration of the instrument, and experimental design and statistical treatment of the data.

Subjects

One hundred and two students enrolled in freshman speech courses at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh and the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater during the winter semester of 1980 participated in the experiment. All the subjects used in the experiment were undergraduate college students ranging from ages 17 to 32.

Materials

The 24-item instrument titled "Human Communication Functional Dominance" was prepared. The instrument describes everyday situations one may encounter. The situations require that some action be taken on the part of the individual. Thus, three responses are given to each item and the subject must choose the answer best suited to what he would do in that same situation. Rather than ranking the three responses, the subjects were asked to circle the one response they would most likely follow. The instrument is appended (see Appendix A).

The second instrument used in the experiment is the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire from the Ohio State Leadership Scales. This instrument is composed of 38 statements concerning how one perceives himself to behave in a leadership/industrial situation. The tool requires one to respond in one of four categories

of frequency: Always, Sometimes, Seldom, Never.

Administration of the Test

The test was administered to 102 subjects with the following instructions: "In the following situations, a variety of responses have to be made. You are to draw upon your familiarity with similar real-life situations that you have encountered to judge which response you would use. Try to put yourself in the shoes of all parties in the stories when you make your decisions. There are no right or wrong answers." The testing period took approximately twenty minutes.

Recording of Data

After the tests had been completed by the subjects, the data obtained from them were recorded on a piece of graph paper. The total number of linking responses and regulation responses that each individual selected were noted.

The data from the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire was recorded in a different manner. The questions were categorized into initiating and consideration dimensions. Every "Always" response received 3 points, "Sometimes" 2 points, "Seldom" 1 point, and "Never" 0 points. Two scores were assessed for each individual: the number of points earned on the initiating dimension and the number of points earned on the consideration dimension. The subjects were then rank ordered on the linking function, regulation function, initiating dimension, and consideration dimension moving from the

highest percentage of points to the lowest.

Design and Statistical Treatment of Data

The design utilized for this research project was a simple correlation between the results obtained on one instrument and the results obtained on the other. A Pearson's Product Moment correlation was obtained by using Spearman's coefficient of rank correlation p (Ferguson, 1976, p. 365). This is a non-parametrical statistic utilizing the following formula:

The rankings for each subject were subtracted from the rankings he had obtained on the leadership scale. This value was squared. Then the total squared values were summed, multiplied by 6, and divided by $N(N^2 - 1)$. This figure was finally subtracted from 1 to arrive at the correlation coefficients.

The results and conclusions from this experimental research will be presented in Section IV.

Section IV

Results and Conclusions

This chapter presents the results of the statistical tests performed on the experimental data. Interpretation and discussion of these results will be presented in the second part of this section.

Results

The Spearman coefficient of rank correlation on the rankings of the linking function with the rankings of the Consideration Structure and Initiating Structure addressed the first research

question of this study:

Will there be a significant relationship between the linking scores obtained on the instrument to measure human communication functional dominance and the consideration scores obtained on the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

a. Will individuals determined to be dominant in the linking function also be dominant in the consideration dimension of the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

b. Will individuals determined to be dominant in the linking function also be low in the consideration of the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

The results of the correlation are summarized in Table 1. The correlation between those scoring high on the linking function and those scoring high on the Consideration structure was .23. The correlation between those scoring high on the linking function and those scoring high on the initiating structure was -.032.

The Spearman coefficient of rank correlation on the ranking of the regulation function with the rankings of the initiating structure and Consideration structure addressed the second research question of this study:

Will there be a significant relationship between regulation scores obtained on the instrument to measure human communication functional dominance and the initiating scores obtained on the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

a. Will individuals determined to be dominant in the regulation function also be dominant in the initiating scores obtained on the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

b. Will individuals determined to be dominant in the regulation function be low in the initiating dimension on the Ohio State Leadership Scales?

The results of the correlation are summarized in Table 2. The correlation between those scoring high on the regulation function and those scoring high on the Initiating structure was .08. The correlation between those scoring high on the regulation function and those scoring high on the Consideration dimension was -.09.

Table 1

Spearman Coefficient of Rank Correlations

	N = 102
Linking vs. Consideration Structure	r = .23
Linking vs. Initiating Structure	r = -.032

Table 2

Spearman Coefficient of Rank Correlations

	N = 102
Regulation vs. Initiating Structure	r = .08
Regulation vs. Consideration Structure	r = -.09

Conclusions

The correlation coefficients found between the variables in this experimental research were extremely low. Thus, the research

questions and the hypothesis initially advanced were unable to be verified in this experiment. This does not mean, however, the assumptions were false; only that they failed to be supported in this investigation. There are a number of factors that could account for the low correlation coefficients.

First, and most importantly, both instruments used in this investigation were very crude and lacked the refinement of many measurement tools. As explained previously, both instruments had questionable validity and numerous internal problems within their structural framework. For example, in several cases, the Ohio State Leadership Scales are measuring extraneous behaviors not related to the two dimensions they purport to measure. The human communication functional dominance scale appears to be securing too many linking responses from subjects which would indicate an internal flaw in the wording of the responses. Both instruments require extensive study and further research into the areas of valid[illegible] and reliability.

Secondly, the two instruments were incomparable for gathering the same data. It was impossible to secure a raw score from either instrument and correlate it since the instruments had different numerical scales of measurement. The Ohio State Leadership Scale was a likert-type measurement criterion, while the functional dominance scale was limited to three responses. This author is confident that there may have been gross errors in the statistical

measurement of the data. Ferguson explains in detail:

> If the ties are numerous, this type of adjustment for tied ranks may not prove altogether satisfactory. The development of p from the ordinary product-moment r assumes that the ranks are the first N integers. Where tied ranks occur this is not so. Where a substantial number of tied ranks is found, the departure of the sum of squares of ranks from the sum of squares of the first N integers will be appreciable and the value of p will be thereby affected. (1976, p. 368)

Since no data for computing raw scores was available, the author was unaware of any other procedures that could have been used in substitution.

Thirdly, the population was one of only college students and needed to be more diversified. The college population differs from the general population in many ways, but one of the most important is that the average intelligence of college students is well above that of the general population (Kline, 1969, p. 407). Subjects of varying intelligence levels may react differently to situations testing their communication functional dominance. Therefore, the experimental population utilized in this study is not representative of the general population.

A fourth consideration is the limited sample size. One hundred and two subjects is not a large enough sample size to generalize the results to other areas. Thus, more subjects may well vary the

results.

Finally, the social desirability of certain responses over others in both instruments is a major concern. Linking responses were three times as prevalent as regulation responses in the data. Specifically, the largest number of linking responses for one individual was 20 out of a possible 24. The largest number of regulation responses received was 8 out of 24. Therefore, it was difficult to establish a person or category of subjects that would be deemed high on the regulation response. Linking responses were perceived to be more socially desirable by the subjects and this is indicated in the frequency of linking responses. This factor alone may have well skewed the results significantly.

Although this research project did not fulfill the goal of helping to verify some assumptions in the area of human communication, it did provide greater insight into the two measuring instruments and some of the weak points in their design. This study indicates that further research needs to be done in this field and similar subject areas following some refinements of the measuring tools. This investigation was of an exploratory nature, designed to gather further information for later research. As Reynolds pointed out in 1971, exploratory research is not aimed at discovering, "the final answer" (p. 155).

Bibliography

Ahmann, J.S. & Block, M.D. (1975). Measuring and evaluating educational achievement. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Applbaum, R.L., Bodaken, E.M., Sereno, K.K., & Anatol, K.W. (1974). The process of group communication. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc.

Bales, R. (1953). Group dynamics: Research and theory, edited by D. Cartwright and A. Zander. New York: Harper & Row.

Badin, Irwin J. (1974). Some moderator influences on relationships between consideration initiating structure, and organizational criteria. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 380-382.

Dance, F.E.X. & Larson, C.E. (1972). Speech communication: concepts and behaviors. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Dance, F.E.X. & Larson, C.E. (1976). The functions of human communication: A theoretical approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Delia, J.G. (1977, February). Constructivism and the study of human communication. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 63, 66-83.

Downey, H.K., Sheridan, J.E., & Slocu, J.W. (1976). The path-goal theory of leadership: A longitudinal analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16, 156-76.

Ferguson, G.A. (1976). Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Fleishman, E.A. & Peters, D.R. (1962). Interpersonal values, leadership attitudes and managerial success. Personnel Psychology, 15, 127-236.

Greene, C.N. (1973). A longitudinal analysis of relationships among leader behavior and subordinate performance and satisfaction. T. Green and D. Ray (Eds.) Academy of Management Proceedings, 433-40.

Halpin, A.W. (1957). The leader behavior and effectiveness of aircraft commanders. In R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus: The Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 52-64.

Halpin, A.W. (1957). Observed leader behavior and ideal leader behavior of aircraft commanders and school superintendents. In R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behavior: Its description and measurement, Columbus: The Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 65-68.

Halpin, A.W. & Winer, B.J. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds.) Leader behavior: Its description and measurement, Columbus: The Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 39-52.

Hemphill, J.K. & Coons, A.E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behavior: Its description and measurement, Columbus: The Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 6-38.

Johnson, S.H. (1979). The development of an instrument to measure human communication functional dominance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation from the University of Denver.

Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C. (1974). Consideration, initiating structure, and organizational criteria - an update of Korman's 1966 review. Personnel Psychology, 27, 555-568.

Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C. Murphy, C. & Stogdill, R. (1974). Toward a contingency theory of leadership based upon the consideration and initiating structure literature. Organizational Behavior And Human Performance, 12, 62-82.

Kline, J. (1969, December). Interaction of evidence and readers' intelligence on the effects of short messages. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 55, 407=413.

Korman, A.K. (1966). Consideration, initiating structure, and organizational criteria--a review. Personnel Psychology, 19 349-361.

Nunnally, J.C. (1970). Introduction to psychological measurement. New York: McGraw Hill.

Petty, M.M. & Pryor, N.M. (1974). A note on the predictive validity of initiating structure and consideration in ROTC training. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39, 383-385.

Reynolds, P.D. (1971). A primer in theory construction. New York: Bobbs Merrill.

Runkle, P.J. & McGrath, J.E. (1972). Research on human behavior: A systematic guide to method. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schriescheim, C., House, R., & Kerr, S. (1976). Leader initiating structure: A reconciliation of discrepant research results and some empirical tests. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15, 297-321.

Schriescheim, C. & Kerr, S. (1974). Psychometric properties of the Ohio state leadership scales. Psychological Bulletin, 756-765.

Schutz, W.C. (1966). The interpersonal underworld (firo). California: Science and Behavior Books.

APPENDIX A

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

An Instrument from the Ohio State Leadership Scales

A Leadership Scale Measurement

The statements below contain descriptions of behaviors that leaders often demonstrate while working with other people. You are asked to select the response that best describes the frequency with which YOU would demonstrate the behavior stated if you were a leader.

1. I refuse to give in when people disagree with me.
   Always Sometimes Seldom Never
2. I do personal favors for the foreman under me.
   Always Sometimes Seldom Never
3. I encourage overtime work. Always Sometimes Seldom Never
4. I express appreciation when one of the workers does a good job.
   Always Sometimes Seldom Never
5. I try out new ideas. Always Sometimes Seldom Never
6. I rule with an iron hand. Always Sometimes Seldom Never
7. I am easy to understand. Always Sometimes Seldom Never
8. I criticize poor work. Always Sometimes Seldom Never
9. I talk about how much should be done.
   Always Sometimes Seldom Never
10. I demand more than the workers can do.
    Always Sometimes Seldom Never
11. I help my foremen with their personal problems.
    Always Sometimes Seldom Never
12. I encourage slow-moving foremen to greater efforts.
    Always Sometimes Seldom Never
13. I criticize my foremen in front of others.
    Always Sometimes Seldom Never
14. I wait for my foremen to push new ideas through before I suggest them.
    Always Sometimes Seldom Never
15. I stand up to my foremen even though it makes me unpopular.
    Always Sometimes Seldom Never
16. I emphasize the quantity of work.
    Always Sometimes Seldom Never
17. I assign people under me to particular tasks.
    Always Sometimes Seldom Never
18. I insist that everything be done my way.
    Always Sometimes Seldom Never

19. I get the approval of my foreman on important matters before going ahead.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

20. I am willing to make changes. Always Sometimes Seldom Never

21. I ask for sacrifices from my foremen for the entire department.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

22. I "needle" my foremen under me for greater effort.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

23. I stress the importance of high morals among those under me.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

24. I back up my foremen in their actions.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

25. I criticize a specific act rather than a particular individual.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

26. I emphasize the meeting of deadlines.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

27. I stress being ahead of competing work groups.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

28. I am friendly and can be easily approached.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

29. I treat all my foremen as my equals.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

30. I offer new approaches to problems.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

31. I insist that I be informed on decisions made by foremen under me.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

32. I see that a foreman is rewarded for a job well done.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

33. I put suggestions that are made by foreman under me into operation.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

34. I try to keep the foremen under me in good standing with those in higher authority.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

35. I make those under me feel at ease when talking to me.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

36. I let others do the work the way they think best.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

37. I will explain my actions when asked.
Always Sometimes Seldom Never

38. I accept suggestions for change. Always Sometimes Seldom Never

APPENDIX B

HUMAN COMMUNICATION FUNCTIONAL DOMINANCE INSTRUMENT

Appendix B

Directions and Final Instrument to Measure Human Communication Functional Dominance

Directions

In this test 24 situations will be presented followed by 3 possible ways to respond. You are asked to rank in preferential order these responses according to the way YOU would react if you were confronted by such a situation. For example, in the following situation, if choice "C" is closest to the way you would respond, place a 1 next to choice "C" on the answer sheet. If "A" is the selection you would choose next, put a 2 on the answer sheet next to it. If "B" would be your last choice, place a 3 next to it on the answer sheet. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

Example:

You have worked for the same manufacturing firm for the past five years. One of your duties is to put together the annual business report. This year a new employee has submitted suggestions for a few changes to the report. You respond by:

A. Disregarding those suggestions made by an employee too new to understand the intricacies of the company.

B. Reviewing the suggestion based upon your own frame of reference and that provided by the company's manual of operations.

C. Calling this individual into your office to discuss his/her suggestions and finding out why he/she feels that they are necessary. Based upon this discussion modify your report where you feel necessary.

1. You are a member of a small group which has just been established to solve a specific problem. Every time you make a suggestion to the group as a whole regarding this problem one member of the group responds to your suggestion in what you perceived to be a negative manner. Your response to this individual is to:

   A. Approach the individual after the group meeting has been concluded and tell him/her that you would like to talk about the meeting. During this discussion attempt to discern what may have caused the negative comments.

   B. Consider the individual's comments based upon your knowledge of this individual and his/her reactions to others in the group.

   C. Suggest to the individual that in order for the group to develop an adequate solution to the problem it is necessary to look for positive as well as negative aspects of the suggestions offered.

2. You've just accepted a job offer in another state. In order to buy a home near your new job you need to sell your present house. To save the realtor's fee you have decided to try and sell the house yourself. You approach to prospective buyers when they come to look at the property is to:

   A. Tell the prospective buyer that you think someone else is about to put a bid on the house and you will be inclined to take the first good offer.

   B. Provide a list on paper of the beneficial aspects of the house, i.e. square feet, age of furnace, maintenance free construction, etc.

   C. Try to establish what the needs of the buyer are and suggest ways in which this house fits those needs.

3. You just finished a written report which constitutes your portion of a group project. After presenting your report to the rest of the group, two of the members challenge a portion of your work suggesting that your data is incorrect. Your response to them is to:

   A. Find out why they think the data is incorrect. Refer to their sources to see if your report does, in fact, need to be changed.

   B. Direct the group to the next topic for discussion.

C. Provide them with a list of the sources you cited and the logic you used in putting the report together.

4. You and a friend have been travelling through Europe for about a month now. You've been especially looking forward to seeing France. Upon your arrival in that country, however, your friend threatens to put a damper on your enthusiasm by complaining that the people are unfriendly and that he/she didn't want to come to France in the first place. You respond by:

   A. Talking to your friend about what France has to offer. Describe the important role of medieval art and architecture in the development of modern man and suggest how exciting it is to have the opportunity to see such contributions to modern culture first hand.

   B. Asking your friend to please keep negative comments to him/herself reminding him/her that the decision was jointly made to visit France.

   C. Talking the situation over with your friend in an attempt to understand what may be causing the conflict. Offer to discuss your plans for seeing the country the next day.

5. Your job for the Bureau of Land Management involves negotiating rights-of-way for various government projects (i.e. roads, public parks, etc.). One case has become an emotional issue for the public and opposition to the proposed project is well organized and strong. You decide to deal with the opposition by:

   A. Writing a description for distribution to the public indicating what the government has in mind and how this will benefit the public if the right-of-way is located where the government suggests.

   B. Working with the public in order to negotiate a compromise suitable to each side.

   C. Indicating that the government has the right to condemn any public property it wishes to establish rights-of-way. In this case it hurts fewer individuals by putting it straight down the county line.

6. Part of your job as head of the accounting department for a large business firm is to write annual evaluations on each of your employees. This year you found it necessary to submit a negative evaluation on an employee. This individual has seen a copy of your report and has just confronted you about the matter. You respond by:

   A. Telling the individual that you feel what was written in the report was true and hopefully through an awareness of these weaknesses he/she can improve.

   B. Explaining to the individual the events, information, and logic which led to the analysis of him/her as it appears in the final evaluation.

C. Offering to discuss the evaluation with the individual. After listening to his/her reaction to the evaluation offer to work with the individual to resolve the problem.

7. One of the students in your third grade class, Tommy, has been increasingly disruptive. Finally, after unsuccessfully trying a series of different strategies to solve the problem you decided it was necessary to speak with Tommy's parents. When his parents arrive you present the problem to them by:

   A. Giving them a description of the events leading up to the phone call which invited them to your office. Based upon your knowledge of Tommy and your observations of his actions explain to his parents what you feel are possible reasons for such behaviors.

   B. Briefly explaining Tommy's behavior. Working with them try to figure out why he may be exhibiting these behaviors.

   C. Briefly explaining Tommy's behavior point out that you have devoted a great deal of time and effort trying to resolve the problem. However, since nothing you have tried has worked suggest that perhaps this is a problem which should be solved by them.

8. You've been employed at the same company now for over a year during which time you feel you've done a productive job. Although you've been there over a year your boss, Mr. Johnson, has given you no indication that you will be receiving a raise so you decide to ask for one yourself. Your approach to your boss is to:

   A. Set up an individual meeting with him to discuss the company's policy on raises. Based upon this discussion explain to your boss why you feel in your case a raise is warranted.

   B. Let your boss know of a job offer made to you by another company. Tell him that although you have very much enjoyed working for his company the other job is for more money and you feel obligated to accept it unless your boss is willing to give you a raise.

   C. Prepare an account of your contributions to the company over the past year. Submit this information to your boss accompanied by your request for an appropriate raise.

9. In assessing your tuition for the semester the University made a $125 error in their favor. When you take your bill into the Financial Office to discuss the discrepancy, the person behind the desk is uncooperative so you:

A. Ask to see the person's superior so that you can discuss the situation with him/her.

B. Make a greater effort to try to understand the argument being presented by the other person. Try to alter your description of how you view the problem based upon your new understanding of the other person's point of view.

C. Explain again that you have registered for 10 hours. Tuition is $50 per hour. Ten hours x $50 per hour = $500 not $625 which is what the University is charging.

10. You and three friends are driving home from a party out in the country on a snowy evening. Suddenly a car approaches from the opposite direction on your side of the road. The driver of the car you are in swerves to miss the approaching car and you wind up stick in a snow drift along the side of the road. You:

A. Try to establish a cohesive group atmosphere by getting everyone to work together in solving the problem. Attempt to synthesize the suggestions of the group in order to develop a workable solution.

B. Because you've been stuck in the snow like this before assume leadership in the group and direct everyone to specific tasks which will work to solve the problem.

C. While the rest of the group discusses the best way to get out of the drift quietly develop a logical plan which should be the easiest and most efficient way to solve the problem.

11. The indeptendent clothing store you manage has been adversely affected by inflation. As a result, emergency measures must be taken to save money. The most obvious solution is to lay off an employee, Jane, who has been with the company for 7 years. Your next step in solving the problem is to:

    A. Call a meeting of all the staff and present the situation to them. Solicit alternative solutions to the problem from them in an attempt to solve the problem.

    B. Before acting on what appears to be the best solution, systematically gather together and review any data that pertains to the store's financial situation. Make a final decision based on your review of this information.

    C. As the manager assume complete responsibility for making the final decision. Review the criteria listed in the company's policy manual for the goals of the company. If the only way to meet these goals is to lay off Jane then proceed with that action.

12. As a seventh grade mathematics teacher you are sometimes confronted with the problem of dealing with your students who have been caught cheating on their examinations. To handle these situations you:

    A. have established a blanket ruling on cheating which your students are made aware of. Anyone caught receives an automatic "F" for the exam.

    B. have decided to deal with each situation individually by talking with the student involved in order to understand why he/she felt cheating was necessary. Work out a suitable punishment for the individual based upon this understanding.

    C. have established criteria by which to review each situation individually. Based upon those criteria and your analysis of the circumstances develop a suitable punishment.

13. As president of your sorority/fraternity you are also a member of the financial planning committee. You have just received the figures on the budget which will be allocated to you for the upcoming year and it is up to your commitee to decide how the money should be spent. For a long time you have felt that the organization needed a remodeled kitchen. To get your ideas across you decided to:

A. Listen to the goals the other members of the committee hope to fulfill utilizing the money. Whenever possible suggest ways that remodeling the kitchen can help to meet these goals.

B. Remind the committee that you could take advantage of the precedent which allows the president to push through a request for funding of a project he/she feels is important.

C. Prepare for distribution at the meeting a breakdown of the anticipated costs and subsequent benefits of remodeling the kitchen.

14. Your best friend has just come to tell you he/she has decided to quit school. This friend has always been a good student and you are surprised at this decision. Your response to your friend's remark is to:

A. Point any fallacies in your friend's reasoning which led to the decision to quit school. Describe the benefits of remaining in school and the need to approach such an important decision carefully.

B. Tell your friend that you think any one with the potential that he/she has for achieving the goals he/she established would be foolish to quit school at this point.

C. Talk with him/her about why he/she feels it is necessary to quit school. Try to understand your friend's point of view and suggest alternative solutions to the problem.

15. You recently purchased a stereo system and as you're setting up the system you discover that one of the speakers is defective. When you attempt to exchange it, the salesperson who sold the system to you implies that the malfunction was your fault. Your next step is to:

A. Restate the events which led up to the discovery that there was a problem with the speaker. Suggest that due to the sequence of these events it appears that you are not responsible for causing the malfunction.

B. Ask to see the manager of the store and discuss the situation with him/her in an effort to solve the problem.

C. Listen to the salesperson's reasons for assuming your responsibility. Try to present your case based upon your understanding of this person's perspective.

16. You are a doctor with a general practice in a small town. It has come to your attention that one of your patients, Mr. Cassals, hasn't been taking the medication you prescribed for a dangerous infection. You decide to:

A. Remind Mr. Cassals of the drastic consequences if he continues to refuse the medication.

B. Remind him of the nature of the infection, what often causes such an infection, the way the medication works to alleviate the problem, and the importance of taking such medication.

C. Ask Mr. Cassals why he is reluctant to take the medication. Based upon his reasoning try to work out a means of administering the medicine which would be acceptable to him.

17. You've been a heavy smoker for years. Recently your spouse has been reading more and more literature on the hazards of smoking and has become concerned about your health. As a result, your spouse recently told you how he/she feels about your smoking. You respond by:

A. Making your spouse aware of the flaws in the research design of the current reports on smoking. Describe the research which opposed the Surgeon General's report.

B. Telling your spouse that you accept his/her concern but feel that you have the right to make your own decisions on whether or not to smoke.

C. Listening carefully to your spouse's concerns. Attempt to understand his/her point of view on this matter.

18. One of your duties as an Assistant Professor in the History Department is to advise history majors in the development of their course program. When a new advisee comes to you for help in this capacity, you:

A. Spend some time talking with the student to determine interest areas, ways the student plans to utilize his/her college education, etc. Working with the student develop a course program which would meet the needs of the student and satisfy departmental and university requirements.

B. Provide the student with a copy of the requirements of the History Department and a copy of general university requirements. Answer any questions the student may have. Have the student develop his/her own course program based upon the requirements, to be submitted to you for your final approval.

C. Tell the student which classes he/she needs to fulfill university and departmental requirements specifying in the layout of the course program when you feel they should be taken. In addition, tell the student what other courses, in your opinion, are vital to the background of a history major.

19. As a dentist you are often confronted with a patient who is overly nervous and as a result makes it more difficult for you to work. You've decided the best approach to take with such patients is to:

A. Tell them that if they relax it will be easier and quicker for you to take care of their filling.

B. Involve them in what you're doing by explaining each step and the purpose behind it.

C. Determine from the patient the specific cause of their anxiety (i.e. fear of the drill, fear of anesthetic) and try to alleviate those fears.

20. The company boss, Mr. Martin, has just asked you to attend the quarterly financial planning session, a task which you feel should more appropriately be done by your immediate superior, the department manager. Because of your feelings on the matter you decide to:

A. Tell the company boss that you feel uncomfortable attending the meeting and ask him why he felt you should be the one to go. In this way determine whether or not you understood the job description for your position.

B. Review the company guidelines on job descriptions for both your position and that of your department manager. Provide the company boss with a synthesis of these guidelines and tell him that based upon this information you feel it would be inappropriate for you to attend the meeting.

C. Suggest to your company boss that it would be more appropriate for your department manager to attend the meeting instead of you.

21. After living in the same apartment for two years you decide it's time for a move. When you tell the manager of the complex, Mr. Allen, that you're leaving he indicates that you won't be receiving your security deposit. You decide to:

    A. Discuss the situation with Mr. Allen. Tell him that if necessary you will file a formal complaint against him with the local housing council and report him to the Better Business Bureau.

    B. Re-read your copy of the lease and compare this with the lease guidelines published by the housing council. Based upon this, point out to your landlord what your rights as a tenant are and describe how you will respond to the problem.

    C. Find out from the manager exactly why he feels the deposit should not be returned. Based upon the manager's reasoning point out where his views may be in error and, if necessary, try to work out a compromise.

22. You have been planning a vacation to California to visit with your family for a long. time. When you check in at the airline ticket counter at the airport, however, you discover that although you've had your reservation for over a month the airline has decided to bump you because of their policy of overbooking to avoid empty seats. You decided to approach the situation by:

    A. Demanding that the person behind the counter find someone else to bump instead of you.

    B. Talking with the person behind the counter to try to work out a suitable solution to the problem.

    C. Obtaining a copy of the FTC regulations which pertain to the airline policy to bumping people. Based on these rules present the person behind the counter with a suitable solution to the problem.

23. As head coach of the local basketball team you've established certain rules governing the behavior of the players. One of these rules which specifies an 11:00 PM curfew when the team is on the road has just been violated by one of the players so you:

    A. Automatically discipline the player according to the rules.

B. Talk with the player to find out why the rule was violated and how the player feels about it. Work out a suitable disciplinary action based upon this discussion.

C. Utilizing your knowledge of the player and any other pertinent information, examine the situation. Based upon this examination develop a suitable disciplinary action.

24. You have just found out that your sister was using the family car without permission and got into a minor accident which did no damage to the other car but dented the fender of the family car. You decide to:

A. Let your sister know that she should tell your parents immediately or you will be forced to.

B. Based on your knowledge of the circumstances, figure out the best way to approach the problem. Provide this to your sister as a possible solution.

C. Find out from your sister how she feels about what has happened. Working with her figure out the best way to remedy the situation.

END

DEPT. OF EDUCATION

NAT'L INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

APRIL

29 - 1985